

## REMARKS

### Request for Reconsideration

Applicant has carefully considered the matters raised by the Examiner in the outstanding Office Action but remain of the opinion that patentable subject matter is present. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Examiner's position based on the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

### Status and Amendment to the Claims

Claims 18-31 are currently pending in this Application and are under examination.

Claim 18 has been amended herein to recite that the frame and the mirror lens are wholly located within the rim portion of the frame and without extending over the outer edges of the rim portion of the housing. These amendments to the claims are necessitated by the Examiner's use of the reference Lang which is a newly cited reference in the Office Action of October 20, 2004.

Support for the amendment is best provided for by the drawings and, specifically, Figure 2 where it is clear that both the frame and the mirror are wholly located within the rim portion of the housing and do not extend over the outer edges of the rim portion of the housing.

#### Rejection of Claims 18-31

Claims 18-22 and 24-31 have been rejected as being anticipated by Lang while Claim 23 has been rejected based on a combination of Lang and Grissen.

With respect to Lang, the Examiner has taken the position that Lang teaches a housing that has a rim portion within which the frame is located without extending laterally over the outer edges of the housing. The Examiner pointed to Column 2, lines 62-65. Respectfully, this is a misreading of Lang. What Lang is teaching is that frame 13 does not extend past the plane of wall 18. In other words, when viewing Figure 1, frame 13 does not extend upward or downward past the plane formed by wall 18 in the horizontal of the Figure. Clearly, frame 13 extends outwardly beyond the edge of the frame and groove-like recess 23 is specifically provided to allow the frame to be fitted into the housing, see Column 2, lines 57-61 wherein it states "an external open groove-like

recess 23 remains between rear 16 of support plate 12 and wall portion 18 of housing 2, causing a stall of the flow of the air during the travel of the vehicle so that the soiling of the surface 14 of mirror 11 is reduced". In fact, one of the alleged novel aspects of Lang is that a groove-like recess is provided outside of the housing in order to prevent soiling of the mirror, see Column 1, lines 60-65.

In order to address the fact that Lang's frame and mirror are not within the rim portion of the frame, Claim 18 has been amended to recite that the frame and the mirror lens are "wholly" within the rim portion of the frame, and to state that they do not extend over the outer edges of the rim portion of the housing in any direction, hence, deletion of the word "lateral". This clearly avoids the teachings of Lang.

Clearly, Lang does not teach a frame and mirror lens which is wholly located within the rim portion of the frame and does not extend outside of the housing.

Respectfully, Claim 18 is patentable over Lang.

With respect to Grissen, he does not teach a frame and a mirror wholly located within the rim portion of the housing. Thus, the combination of Grissen and Lang does not result in the rear view mirror of Claim 18.

#### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the Application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Should any extensions of time or fees be necessary in order to maintain this Application in pending condition, appropriate requests are hereby made and authorization is given to debit account #02-2275.

Respectfully submitted,

MUSERLIAN, LUCAS AND MERCANTI, LLP

By: Donald C. Lucas  
Donald C. Lucas  
(Attorney for Applicants)  
475 Park Avenue South  
New York, New York 10016  
Tel. # (212) 661-8000

DCL/mr

Encl: Return receipt post-card